

Application Serial No. 09/434,394

Attorney Docket No. 114596-20-4009

Amendment Dated October 24, 2006 – Request for Reconsideration of Action of July 18, 2006

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

By this paper, Applicant responds to the Office Action of July 18, 2006 and supplements the previously response of October 11, 2006, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

**I. It is Believed No Extension of Time is Necessary**

A Response was timely filed on October 11, 2004. In a telephone interview of October 24, further formalities were discussed. This Supplemental Amendment incorporates the amendments of October 11, which it was agreed, would not be entered.

It is believed that the October 11, 2004 paper tolled the time to respond to the Office Action of July 18, 2006. If a one-month extension of time is required for entry of this paper, Applicant petitions for such extension, and requests that the petition fee of \$110.00 be charged to Deposit Account No. 23-2405, Order No. 114596-20-4009.

**II. Interview Summary**

In a series of telephone interviews in September and October 2006, the following were agreed:

The amendments to claims 2, 14, 22 and 30 are not narrowing. Rather, they merely state expressly the broadest reasonable interpretation of the term “segment descriptor” consistent with the specification, the ordinary and customary meaning of the term, the meaning that the term would have to a person of ordinary skill in the art in question at the time of the invention, and the interpretation that was previously inherent in the application as filed.

The claim amendments have been evaluated for compliance with the “written description” requirement of § 112 ¶ 1 and the “new matter” prohibition of § 132, and the Examiner concludes that no rejection or objection is warranted.

All rejections set forth in the last Office Action are withdrawn.

In a second telephone interview of October 24, 2006, the Examiner observed a number of informalities in the claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful review of the claims and for his generous time in explaining his observations.

Application Serial No. 09/434,394

Attorney Docket No. 114596-20-4009

Amendment Dated October 24, 2006 – Request for Reconsideration of Action of July 18, 2006

### III. Amendments

Most of the amendments proposed in this paper respond to non-statutory informalities noted by the Examiner. It was agreed that most were informalities of style, and did not rise to the level of § 112 ¶ 2 rejections. Applicant notes that only the amendments to claims 36 and 56 are narrowing. Most of the other amendments merely make explicit that which was previously inherent, revert to the original claim language that was changed in a word processing accident, or otherwise resolve informalities without changing claim scope.

As noted in the documents incorporated by reference into the specification, many computers instantiate “segment descriptors” in at least two forms – a data structure in memory, and segment registers or other hardware for fast access during address translation. Applicant draws the Examiner’s attention to a refinement of the language added to claims 2, 14, 22 and 30 relating to “segment descriptor,” to note that not all segment descriptors are used to form “physical” addresses.

### IV. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. In the event that any extension of time is required, Applicant petitions for that extension of time required to make this response timely. Kindly charge any additional fee, or credit any surplus, to Deposit Account No. 23-2405, Order No. 114596-20-4009.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLKIE FARR &amp; GALLAGHER LLP

Dated: October 24, 2006By: David E. Boundy

David E. Boundy

Registration No. 36,461

WILLKIE FARR &amp; GALLAGHER LLP

787 Seventh Ave.

New York, New York 10019

(212) 728-8757

(212) 728-8111 Fax

Supplemental Amendment  
This paper dated October 24, 2006page  
16

114596-20-4009

S/N 09/434,394  
3456508.1